

CS



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/409,898	10/01/1999	ARILD O. GAUTESTAD	10250-0001-2	6015

22850 7590 09/25/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/409,898

Applicant(s)

GAUTESTAD, ARILD O.

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 7/9/2003.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 1-27 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 14, and 21 are independent claims.

3. The rejections of claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-12, 14, 16-17, 19-24, and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by King et al, hereinafter King (Pat.# 5,956,737, 9/21/1999) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

4. The rejections of claims 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

5. The rejections of claims 5, 10, 18, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King, in view of Cohen et al, hereinafter Cohen (Pat. # 6,377,983, 4/23/2002, filed on 11/13/1998) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Drawings

6. The drawings filed on 7/9/2003 have been accepted by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. Appropriate correction has been made to claim 15, therefore its 35 USC § 112 rejection has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-12, 14, and 16-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al, hereinafter King (Pat.# 5,956,737, 9/21/1999), in view of Freivald et al, hereinafter Freivald (Pat.# 5,898,836, 4/27/1999).

Regarding independent claim 1, King discloses the input, creation, and storage in a computer of a document with a *first item description*—"Rod products" description—, a *first item category*—"Bass Products" 162--*first item identifier*—"Rod Products" 200. This document — contains a list of descriptions, including a portion of Rod products description-- *first item* and a hypertext link reference to a more detailed web page of the Rods description created before a user accesses the document listing the items--192 (c.10,L.23- 6, fig. 12-14). King fails to explicitly teach *generating a log file* *modification to at least one of the first item description electronic*

Art Unit: 2178

document and the first category list electronic document; updating the log file when the at least one modification is made to at least one of the first item description electronic document and the first category list electronic document; and deciding whether to transfer at least one of the first item description electronic document and the first category list electronic document based on whether the log file contains the at least one modification for a corresponding electronic document. Freivald teaches the generation of a database—*log file*—for storing updated or fresh versions of documents' checksums or "CRCs", which reflect whether or not an HTML document has changed since a last change detection check. If the document has changed, the CRC for that document is updated, and stored in the database. Based upon whether there is a change in the document content, a notice is generated to alert a user of the HTML document content change or modification to allow the user to quickly find documents the user is interested in (col.4, lines 7-67, col. 7, lines 1-67, and col. 12, lines 23-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of HTML document generation taught by King, and the HTML document content change detection as taught by Freivald, because this would provide the benefit of allowing a user to quickly access the changes to a document of interest as taught by Freivald (col. 12, lines 23-67).

Claims 2-3 are directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claim 1, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, King discloses the input, creation, and storage in a computer of a document with a *second item description*—"Net products"

Art Unit: 2178

description—, *a second item category*—“Bass Products” 162--, *second item identifier*—“Net Products” 202. This document contains a list of a portion of Net products description, and a hypertext link reference to a more detailed web page of the Net description -- (c.10,L.23-67, c.18,L.57-c.19,L.16, fig. 12-14).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, King discloses the storage in a computer of a document containing formatted text with a *first item description*—“Rod products” description—, *a first item category*—“Bass Products” 162--, *first item identifier*—“Rod Products” 200. This document is converted from a single page document into a three pages an HTML document—*second digital storage area*. (c.10,L.23-67, c.18,L.57-c.19,L.16, fig. 12-14). King fails to explicitly disclose: *updating the log file to include a reference to the first text formatted electronic document*. Freivald teaches the update of the database—*log file*— which stores updated or fresh versions of the HTML documents’ checksums or “CRCs”—*reference to the first formatted electronic document*, which reflect whether or not an HTML document has changed since a last change detection check. (col. 7, lines 1-67, and col. 12, lines 23-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of HTML document generation taught by King, and the HTML document content change detection as taught by Freivald, because this would provide the benefit of allowing a user to quickly access the changes to a document of interest as taught by Freivald (col. 12, lines 23-67).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, King discloses the storage of the document describing the products in a server side database -- (c.8,L.16-67).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, King discloses the creation of the HTML document using a template-- (c.10,L.23-67, c.18,L.57-c.19,L.16).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, King discloses a product web page with a reference to the home page—*first category list electronic document* (c.10,L.23-67, c.18,L.57-c.19,L.16, fig. 12A-C).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 1, King discloses a product web page with a reference to the home page—*first category list electronic document* --according to the template (c.10,L.23-67, c.18,L.57-c.19,L.16, fig. 12A-C).

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 1, King discloses the display, and search of a document—194-- containing category information—“Bass Products”-- corresponding to the list included in a table of contents—*category list electronic document* --according to the template (c.10,L.23-67, c.18,L.57-c.19,L.16, fig. 12A-C). King fails to explicitly disclose: *using the log file to determine whether to retrieve the first item description electronic document...* Freivald teaches using the database—*log file*—, which reflect whether or not an HTML document has changed since a last change detection check, for generating a notice to alert a user of the HTML document content change or modification to allow the user to quickly find documents the user is

interested in—*electronic document with first item category*. The database—*log file*—is responsible for storing updated or fresh versions of documents' checksums or "CRCs"—*a reference to at least one electronic document*, which reflect whether or not an HTML document has changed since a last change detection check (col.4, lines 7-67, col. 7, lines 1-67, and col. 12, lines 23-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of HTML document generation taught by King, and the HTML document content change detection as taught by Freivald, because this would provide the benefit of allowing a user to quickly access the changes to a document of interest as taught by Freivald (col. 12, lines 23-67).

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 1, King discloses a computer application in a first computer for publishing HTML documents on Internet servers by transferring the documents to these Internet servers (c.6,L.50-67, c.8,L.19-67, c.51,L.7-67, fig. 12A-C).

Claim 12 is directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claim 11, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claims 14, and 16-20 are directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claims 11, 1, and 4-7 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 21-27 are directed towards a computer program product for storing, and implementing the steps found in claims 1-7 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

10. Claims 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King, in view of Freivald.

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 12, King discloses a computer application in a first computer for publishing HTML documents on Internet servers by transferring the documents to these Internet servers (c.6,L.50-67, c.8,L.19-67, c.51,L.7-67, fig. 12A-C). King, and Freivald fail to explicitly disclose: *an Internet service provider computer*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the document in a second computer in an Internet service provider--ISP, because King teaches above the publishing of web page documents on the Internet from a local computer, so as to publish the web pages on the Internet on a ISP, which enables users across the Internet to access such web pages.

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 14, King discloses the creation of a document with a field containing product description, being stored in the computer (c.6,L.50-67, c.8,L.19-67, c.51,L.7-67, fig. 12A-C). King, and Freivald fail to explicitly disclose: *store the first item description electronic document in the first digital storage area in the first computer using a first file name corresponding to the first item category*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stored the document with a file name corresponding to the category, because King teaches above the publishing of web page documents, and to label the document corresponding to the category document list.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Applicant submits that King does not each or suggest the generation of a log file, which contains at least a modification to an electronic document (page 14, line 25-page 15, line 4). The Applicant is directed to the rejections of these limitations, in light of the new rejections based upon the newly added amendment.

Claims 1, 5, 10, 13-15, 18, 21, and 25 are rejected for the same reasons above, since these claims depend from the independent claims containing the newly added limitations.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2178

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Pogrebisky et al. (Pat. # 5,958,008).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 746-7238, (for **After Final** communications intended for entry)
- (703) 746-7239, (for **Formal** communications intended for entry, **except formal After Final communications**)

Or:

- (703) 746-7240, (for **Informal or Draft** communications for discussion only, please label **"PROPOSED"** or **"DRAFT"**).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,

Application/Control Number: 09/409,898

Page 11

Art Unit: 2178

Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

CBP

9/17/03


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER